

OCT 13 1923

UNIV. OF MICH.

OCT 12 1923

LIBRARIAN'S OFFICE

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVII, No. 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1923

WHOLE No. 452

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

*Publications of the*

## American Classical League

*The latest list of publications includes addresses by*  
**President Calvin Coolidge, Secretaries Hughes and Hoover,**  
*and statements by*  
**Presidents Wilson, Taft, and Roosevelt**  
*on behalf of Classical Education*

*There have also been added*

1. THE NEW ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CLASSICS IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF FRANCE, a paper in three parts:
  - I. Editorial on "The Classics in France", reprinted from The New York Times, June 17, 1923.
  - II. Complete Text of Report of M. Leon Berard, Minister of Public Instruction in France.
  - III. Complete Text of the Decree of May 3, 1923.
2. SHALL WE CONTINUE LATIN AND GREEK IN OUR SCHOOLS?, by John J. Tigert, United States Commissioner of Education. Address read at the Fourth Annual Meeting of the American Classical League, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, June, 1923.

**Price, ten cents**

**Price, five cents**

*These are papers that should be in the hands of parents, educators, and all thinking people*

These pamphlets, and many others written in support of classical studies are distributed at cost to members of the American Classical League, on application to the Secretary. Write for new list of publications. DUES ARE NOW PAYABLE: 25 cents, if you are already member of a Classical Association, otherwise \$1.00 per year.

**Address**

**American Classical League, Princeton, N. J.**

## Power in Latin Composition

PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN gives power in Latin Composition. The twenty exercises in the "Training Camp" preceding the reading of Caesar have two hundred sentences and include all the more important constructions. These two hundred sentences according to the plan of the "Training Camp" develop the pupil's power and are sufficient for the needs of any class.

The ability to translate from English into Latin depends on *three* things:

1. An accurate knowledge of the inflections
2. A mastery of a definite vocabulary of carefully selected words
3. A real understanding of the more important principles of syntax

With these three things firmly established, a pupil finds Latin Composition a pleasure, for he can handle it with power. In the SECOND YEAR LATIN the "Training Camp" offers a definite plan for establishing these three essentials, each with single emphasis.

### PLACE'S SECOND YEAR LATIN

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D.,  
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

576 pages

Price, \$1.68

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

## From ox-carts to aeroplanes—from the first Virgil to the *Greenough-Kittredge-Jenkins Edition of* Virgil's Aeneid and Ovid's Metamorphoses

THE text of Books I-VI of the Aeneid, selections from Books VII-XII together with a summary of the omitted portions of the text, the Ovid required for college preparatory work—all in one volume. An interesting and up-to-date introduction including sections on the Augustan Age, Life and Works of Virgil, Life and Works of Ovid, Grammar and Style of the Aeneid and Versification of the Aeneid; ample and scholarly annotations; excellent typography; an abundance of carefully-chosen illustrations; a complete vocabulary—all in the same volume.

### Ginn and Company

Boston

New York

Chicago

London

Atlanta

Dallas

Columbus

San Francisco

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 2

MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1923

WHOLE NO. 452

## WANTED—LIGHT ON TWO PUZZLES

When I first studied Latin, it was the practice for makers of straw hats to put on the little band that crossed the top of the hat, within, a Latin motto or expression. Because I was studying Latin, other boys often asked me to interpret these Latin words or expressions. Frequently I was unable to do so. In those days that fact caused me some trouble and chagrin, but I have since learned not to be disturbed in the slightest degree if I find myself unable to interpret a piece of detached Latin, particularly if it has been made up by somebody or other in modern times. On this point I heartily endorse what Professor Nutting said (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.43) about the absurdity of a certain 'test', employed several years ago by "a self-appointed expert with more zeal than knowledge", as a means of confounding Latinists by proving that the teaching of Latin was without effect. It would be pretty easy, I am quite certain, to confound many a student of English by confronting him with expressions torn from their contexts in masterpieces of English literature. A certain University has the motto, if I remember it correctly, *Perstando et praestando* (I may have the order of the two main words reversed, but that is immaterial). What does this mean? Before one can give a definite answer, he must know what the person who made it up thought it meant. Was he using a dative, or did he think he was using an ablative?

So I was not particularly ashamed of myself when I found myself recently unable to solve a couple of puzzles presented to me, almost, as it happens, in the same mail.

One correspondent wrote as follows:

Are the following Latin words ancient? if so, who wrote them?

*Heu, quanto minus est cum reliquis versari quam vestrum meminisse.*

He was troubled by the fact that *vestrum*, rather than *vestri*, is used here with *meminisse*.

Another correspondent sent a clipping from an article (whose source was not indicated) which declared that the great classical scholar Porson wrote, as a motto, over the old tavern known as Cider Cellar's Tavern, at No. 20 Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, London (a tavern immortalized by Thackeray), the following words:

*Honos erit huic quoque homo.*

Finding myself unable to make anything out of these five words, I copied out this passage, and the one transcribed above, and sent them to three distinguished classical scholars, with an appeal for help. One of them has made me no reply thus far. A second declared himself unable to give any light, except that it

would be easily possible to rearrange the first passage, *Heu, quanto, etc.*, so as to make hexameter rhythm out of it. The third scholar said he would have to take a "flunk". He suggested that I might put these questions up to Mr. Edison!

Can any one throw light upon these passages?

CHARLES KNAPP

## IS THE ABLATIVE ABSOLUTE NECESSARY?

Some time ago a lady in a certain College wrote me asking me why the ablative absolute was necessary in Latin. She said that this question was asked in a certain Latin Grammar — a Latin Grammar of which, as it happens, I had never heard. I asked her to specify more particularly the book she had in mind. But I have not heard further from her. In commenting on her own question, she said that she knew that the ablative absolute in Latin makes up for the lack of the perfect participle in the active voice. However, she added, this lack could be supplied by a clause, especially by one introduced by *cum* or by *dum*. So why, she asked again, is the ablative absolute necessary?

It may be that, in these days when there is so much clamor from teachers in the High Schools for practical matter, my attempt to answer this question will be of interest to someone other than the one to whom it was addressed. I wrote as follows:

In one sense very few forms of expression are necessary. For example, the Romans thought it necessary to have an ablative case. At any rate, they retained the ablative case. The Greeks did not. The ancient Hindus, in the language known as Sanskrit, thought it necessary to have eight cases in all. The modern languages get along pretty well without case forms, do they not?

So I suppose you could make out a pretty good case for the doctrine that the ablative absolute was not really necessary. On the other hand, it is handy. One reason why it is handy is its very vagueness. As a means of helping the modern student to understand matters of case and matters of mood, we have introduced all sorts of classifications. We get exactness in that way, and so are helped to a minuter and more careful understanding of the original. But I am certain that it would bother a Roman, could you resurrect him to-day, if he were asked to interpret various forms of Latin expression, as we interpret them to-day. To the Romans, the ablative absolute was a great wide category whose very indefiniteness gave them immense freedom.

In passing we may note that our present names for different sorts of ablatives, or for different kinds of subjunctives are all distinctly modern—very modern.

Why did man take the trouble—and it must have cost infinite trouble through endless ages almost—to evolve eight cases, to evolve not only a subjunctive mood and an infinitive mood, but also an optative mood, with

separate and distinct forms of its own, and then in course of time to throw some of those things away as completely as the modern man has done? I suppose the answer is that man could not foresee at the beginning all possible linguistic developments, and so had to feel his way.

Personally, I prefer the Roman style of speech, with its subordination made through clauses and through the ablative absolute, to the type of English that is dominant to-day, which has nothing but independent simple sentences arranged one after the other without any kind of logical connection, so that the effect of modern English prose style is to me much like the fire of a machine gun.

CHARLES KNAPP

### PLINY AND THE SPIRIT OF YOUTH<sup>1</sup>

Pliny's letters have the *cachet* of youth. His outlook on life, his romantic devotion to his friends, his chivalrous attitude toward women, so rare in those giddy-paced days, his naïve vanity, his lively interest in the younger generation, his singular regard for the *recitatio*—the ancient counterpart of the modern 'tea' in its annoyance to the stronger sex—, are better understood, if we remember that Pliny had the finely-wrought temperament of a youth.

In writing to Lupercus (2. 5), enclosing an *actio* for criticism, he asks Lupercus to be lenient with parts of the speech, because some thought must be given to the taste of the young (5): *sunt enim quaedam adolescentium auribus danda, praesertim si materia non refragetur*.

The Senate had decreed a statue to Vestricius Spurinna, and, to console the father for the loss of his son, who had died while the father was away on a military expedition, one also for the boy. Pliny (2. 7) lauds the boy's character, his dignity, his authority. Of his own affection for Spurinna's son, Pliny writes (6): *Amavi consummatissimum iuvenem tam ardentem quam nunc impatienter requiro*.

In 2. 18 Pliny tells of his delight in revisiting the scenes of his early education, in quest of a teacher for the nephews of Mauricus. He seats himself, as of old, among the boys. On one occasion, he found them conversing loudly among themselves, but, at the approach of the great orator, they fell into a respectful silence. Pliny admits to Rufus (3. 1) that there is in youth a certain disorder and restlessness which is becoming (2): *nam iuvenes adhuc confusa quaedam et quasi turbata non indecent*. Nor was Pliny in sympathy with the rigidity of fathers in handling their sons. A friend of Pliny was berating, in Pliny's presence, his offspring (9. 12. 1), *quod paulo sumptuosius equos et canes emeret*. The father was so inflexible that Pliny, with his native sympathy with those of tender years, made vehement protest (*ibidem*): *Heus tu, numquamne fecisti quod a patre corripui posset? Fecisti, dico? Non interdum facis quod filius tuus, si*

*repente pater ille, tu filius, pari gravitate reprehendat?*

However cordially he may have disliked the notorious informer, Regulus, Pliny has some regard for Regulus's son. The boy had just died; Pliny (4. 2. 1) calls the lad *acris ingenii, sed ambiguus*, and adds, *qui tamen posset recta sectari, si patrem non referret*. Regulus ostentatiously killed all the son's pets at the pyre—nightingales, parrots, ponies, dogs.

Whenever it was possible, Pliny attended the readings of his friends. In 5. 17 he writes to Spurinna about a reading given by Calpurnius Piso. Pliny not only remarked the excellence of the matter read, but the appearance of the poet—his pleasing voice, his flushed, anxious face. After the reading, Pliny, in his characteristic way, rushed up to the poet (4): *. . . multum ac diu exosculatus adolescentem . . . laudibus incitavi; pergeret qua coepisset . . .* Occasionally, however, when Pliny is out of humor with himself, he complains, with some warmth, of the fledglings who come direct from the Schools to the courts to plead. He tells Maximus (2. 14. 1) that there are few in the courts with whom he cares to plead; the rest *audaces atque etiam magna ex parte adulescentuli obscuro ad declamandum huc transierunt*. . . The young lawyers frequently kept Pliny before them as their model in speaking. In another letter (6. 11), he tells of his being called into consultation by the prefect and hearing two young men of promise, Fuscus Salinator and Ummidius Quadratus, plead on opposite sides of a case. Pliny informs Maximus quite ingenuously of his delight in the fact that they kept their eyes fixed on him, their guide and master.

Teachers may be interested in the letter (7. 9), which he addresses to a young man, Fuscus, who had written to Pliny anent methods of study. Pliny suggests the practice of translating from Greek into Latin and vice versa (1). One gains from this, he says, *proprietas splendorque verborum, copia figurarum, vis explicandi, praeterea imitatione optimorum similia inveniendi facultas*. A good plan, after you have mastered the matter of your author, is to write something on the same subject; then compare what you have written with the model. Pliny suggests (5) a valuable means of selfcriticism which modern authors employ: *post oblivionem retractare, multa retinere, plura transire, alia interscribere, alia rescribere*. He also believes (15) in selecting for reading *cuiusque generis auctores diligenter*. . . *aiunt enim multum legendum esse, non multa*.

Pliny holds that the prime requisite for the teacher of youth is character. In a letter addressed to Corellia Hispulla (3. 3), he says that it is time for her to look around for a teacher for her son. This teacher should be (3. 7) a rhetor Latinus, *cuius scholae severitas, pudor, in primis castitas constet*. . . *a quo mores primum, mox eloquentiam discat, quae male sine moribus discitur*. Pliny has a genuine regard for the teaching profession, and for teachers in particular. He mentions (5), as a possible teacher for the son of Corellia, Julius Genitor, for whom he has a warm personal affection. *Genitor is vir emendatus et gravis, paulo*

<sup>1</sup>I cite Pliny from the critical edition of Professor E. T. Merrill (Teubner, Leipzig, 1922). Juvenal from the text of G. Hermann (Teubner, 1897).



etiam horridior et durior, ut in hac licentia temporum. These last words suggest that all was not well with the Rome of his day. Recognizing the need of a School in his native town, Pliny is willing to give a third toward the support of the institution (4.13).

In a letter addressed to Nepos (2.3) he writes about the famous rhetor, Isaeus, who had recently come to Rome (1): *summa est facultas, copia, ubertas*. Isaeus speaks Greek, or rather, Attic. His method is to propose several topics for discussion, and he gives his audience permission to suggest others. It is noteworthy that the subject of Pliny's encomiums is sixty-three years of age. Of teachers as a class Pliny has this to say (2.3.5): *quo genere hominum nihil aut sincerius aut simplicius aut melius*. He writes (4.11) of an ex-praetor, Licinianus, who, having been exiled to Sicily, had set up there as a teacher of oratory. Licinianus, in the opening remarks to his class, said (2): *Quos tibi, Fortuna, ludos facis! facis enim ex professoribus senatores, ex senatoribus professores*. This relegated ex-praetor had sullied the purple by an un-speakable crime.

Pliny has all the passion of youth in his friendships, and his friends are again and again mentioned with such generous praise that one feels that Pliny's words are colored by the imagination of the author. He himself (7.28) realizes that he may be too prodigal on this head (2): *ut enim non sint tales quales a me praedicantur, ego tamen beatus, quod mihi videntur*. If this, indeed, be a fault with Pliny, it is a colorable one. Pliny is broad awake to the interests of his friends' material welfare. In 1.14 he recommends Minicius Acilianus to Junius Mauricus for some preferment; compare §3: . . . *Acilianus, qui me ut iuvenis iuvenem (est enim minor pauculis annis) familiarissime diligit*. . . In a letter addressed to Erucius (1.16), he says of Pompeius Saturninus (1): *Amabam Saturninum . . . nunc vero totum me tenet, habet, possidet*. He is detained at Rome by the illness of a friend (1.22.1) *quem singulariter et miror et diligo*.

Of Voconius, whom he recommends to the favor of Priscus (2.13), he writes (5): *Hunc ego, cum simul studeremus, arte familiariterque dilexi: ille meus in urbe, ille in secessu contubernalis, cum hoc seria, cum hoc iocos miscui. Quid enim illo aut fidelius amico aut sodale iucundius?* Servianus has betrothed his daughter to Fuscus, whom, says Pliny (6.26.2), *amorem effuse*. Of an old boyhood chum he writes to Priscus (6.8.2): *ipsi amare in vicem, qui est flagrantissimus amor, adulescentuli coepimus*. Pliny, returning to Rome, misses Tiro, to whom he writes (6.1.2): *Quidquid in causa, eripe me huic tormento: veni, aut ego illuc unde inconsulte properavi revertar vel ob hoc solum, ut experiar an mihi, cum sine me Romae coeperis esse, similes his epistulas mittas*. Friends should share one another's grief: *est enim quaedam etiam dolendi voluptas, praesertim si in amici sinu defleas, apud quem lacrimis tuis vel laus sit parata vel venia* (8.16.5).

Pliny professes admiration for the ancients, but he does not scorn the writers of his own day. He had recently heard Verginius Romanus read, to a select

coterie, a comedy in the manner of the ancients, written with such exquisite taste, *ut esse quandoque possit exemplar* (6.21.2). Romanus had written comedies in the manner of Menander, which deserved a place beside those of Plautus and Terence. Arrius writes verses of such excellence that Pliny himself tries to imitate them, but is unable to do so (5.15). Of this Arrius he says elsewhere (4.3.3): *nam et loquenti tibi Homericis senis mella profluere, et quae scribis complere apes floribus et innectere videntur*. Extravagant language, to be sure, but from the soul of youth. Juvenal (1.1-18) pays his devoirs to the poetasters of his day, with the usual pungency.

Pliny (1.13) gives us an excellent picture of the *recitatio*. He says that in April scarcely a day passed without someone reading his poems to a gathering of friends. Maugre the apathy of the public to these affairs, Pliny says, *vigent studia*. The greater number of the invited guests gather outside the reader's hall, plying their tongues busily, sending now and again someone to report the progress of the reading; and, when the reader is about finished, they straggle in, only to go out again soon, some surreptitiously, others with no show at concealment. Pliny scarcely ever refuses an invitation to a reading. Juvenal (7.84-87), in lamenting the slender circumstances of contemporary poets, says that people run to hear the pleasant voice of Statius, reciting his Thebais:

tanta dulcedine captos  
afficit ille animos, tantaque libidine vulgi  
auditur, sed cum fregit subsellia versu,  
esurit, intactam Paridi nisi vendit Agaven.

It seems to have been Pliny's custom to read to invited friends speeches which he had already delivered in court (2.19). In 5.21 he thanks Pompeius Saturninus for the postponement of a *recitatio* until Pliny's return to the city. In another letter (5.3) we learn that Titius Aristo has informed Pliny that Pliny had been criticized because he composed and recited *versiculos severos parum* (2). Pliny pleads *homo sum*, and cites notable precedents for his bad habit. Pliny's arguments for the *recitatio* are: that the reader becomes a better critic of his own work; that he can settle doubtful points by the criticism of his friends; and that he can discover much concerning the worth of his work by the attitude of his hearers.

Pliny, in a letter to Restitutus (6.17), is in a dudgeon because of what occurred at a *recitatio* which he had recently attended. The book read was *absolutissimus*, but there were two or three persons in the audience (2), *ut sibi et paucis videntur, disertis, surdis mutisque similes audiebant*. *Non labra diduxerunt, non moverunt manum, non denique adsurrexerunt, saltem lassitudine sedendi*. In 6.15 Pliny tells about another reading given by Passennus Paulus, a Roman knight, and an inditer of elegies, who claimed descent from Propertius. *Gentilicium hoc illi, says Pliny, with dry wit (1), of his writing of elegies*. This Passennus was reading a poem of his own composing, which began *Prisce, iubes*. Now there was in his audience a person of that name, who quickly injected, what was, to his seeming, a clever remark: *Ego vero non iubeo*. Pliny

has been taxed with possessing no feeling for humor. In the course of my reading, I have excerpted numerous passages illustrative of what seems to me not only a sense of humor, but humor of a very delicate sort (compare 1.6; 1.7; 7.6; 7.12; 7.21; 9.25; 9.26). We have recorded in another letter (7.17) a second charge that there are some who disapprove of Pliny's reading his speeches, a charge which calls forth from Pliny an elaborate defense of the *recitatio*. We learn in 8.21 the tremendous fact that Pliny read for two days in succession: *hoc adsensus audientium exegit* (4). He himself attended a reading of Augurinus for three days *cum summa mea voluptate, immo etiam admiratione* (4.27.1).

Pliny's vanity is never stiffnecked, and is always honest, for it possesses all the ingenuousness of a child 'showing off'. In a well-known letter (1.5), he details the manner in which he worsted the informer, Regulus, who, he says (7), *conticuit: me laus et gratulatio secuta est*. At the trial of Priscus (2.11), Caesar himself showed great concern and interest in the pleader, Pliny. Pliny's appointment as *augur* (4.8) leads him to remind his correspondent that the great Caesar had held the same office. Tacitus was one day sitting at the Circensian games beside a Roman knight, who asked the historian whether he was an Italian or a provincial. Tacitus replied (9.23.2): *Nosti me, et quidem ex studiis, whereupon the knight asked Tacitus, Tacitus es an Plinius?*

Valerius Paulinus (4.16) is asked to share Pliny's joy in the fact that there are people in Rome who still honor studies. Pliny had recently pleaded before the centumviral court, and the press was so great that the only means of getting to his place was *per ipsos iudices* and he adds this most remarkable fact (2): *ad hoc quidam ornatus adulescens scissis tunicis, ut in frequentia solet, sola velatus toga perstitit, et quidem horis septem*. Small wonder that Pliny's vanity was touched! In a letter to Gallus (4.17), promising Gallus that he will appear as counsel for Corellia, he is led to relate a conversation which took place in the presence of Nerva, concerning the promising young men of the times: *cum . . . plerique me laudibus ferrent*, says Pliny (8). Corellius, who was present, remained silent for a while and then (8), *Necesse est, inquit, parcius laudem Secundum, quia nihil nisi ex consilio meo facit*. Pliny (7.20) proudly acquaints Tacitus with the fact that whenever people talk about oratory Tacitus and Pliny are mentioned together; that there are some who prefer Pliny, some Tacitus; that in wills both are mentioned side by side.

Pliny's attitude toward women possesses all the gentleness of romantic youth, and none of the bitterness of Juvenal. In a letter addressed to Corellia (7.14), who had written to Pliny insisting on paying 900,000 sesterces for some land she had bought of Pliny, through a freedman, for 700,000 sesterces, Pliny says (2): *. . . ego et rogo et exigo ut . . . patiaris . . . me in hoc uno tibi eodem animo repugnare, quo in omnibus obsequi soleo*. Note also the delightful letter (4.19) written to his mother-in-law, Calpurnia, in which,

after a graceful address to her, he expatiates on the virtues of his wife, Calpurnia. In a famous letter (6.20) in which he recounts the harrowing experiences of his mother and himself, after the departure of the Elder Pliny on his ill-starred mission of mercy, when the earth tremors became so violent that they had decided to leave town, Pliny says (12): *Tum mater orare, hortari, iubere quoque modo fugerem, posse enim iuvenem, se et annis et corpore gravem bene morituram, si mihi causa mortis non fuisset*. Juvenal, in many places, pours the vials of his wrath upon the women of his day. In 1.22-25 he says that it is hard not to write satire *cum tener uxorem ducat spado*, Maevia Tuscum figat aprum et nuda teneat venabula mamma; in 6.47-49 he counsels Ursidius, a notorious man-about-town, who is on the look out for a virtuous wife, as follows:

*Delicias hominis! Tarpeium limen adora  
pronus et auratam Iunoni caede iuvencam,  
si tibi contigerit capitis matrona pudici.*

Perhaps Juvenal had known only Rome's birds of passage. His venom has the suggestion of personal experience with this class.

ELI EDWARD BURRISS

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,  
NEW YORK CITY

## REVIEWS

Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin.  
By Otto Jespersen. New York: Henry Holt (1922).  
Pp. 448.

Professor Jespersen's intention in writing his book, *Language: Its Nature, Development, and Origin*, was to combine the results of his previous published studies in linguistics with new material to form something like a system. Considerations of space induced him to omit several chapters, some of which are to be included in a forthcoming work on the *Logic of Grammar*. But, even if the original plan had been followed out, we should not have had a really systematic treatise; Professor Jespersen is too original a thinker to make a skilful systematizer. Instead, we have an incisive and provocative discussion of a large number of linguistic topics. Several of these are controversial in their nature, and even in discussing the others the author has emphasized his contributions in a way that is likely to bring sharp rejoinders. The reviewer is of the opinion that Professor Jespersen is usually in the right, and that his vigorous dissent from current opinion is altogether salutary. On the whole, the book is possibly the most important recent contribution to the science of language.

Some of the most important things in it are repeated from earlier works and may be passed over briefly here, although the author has usually strengthened his case by answering objections and introducing new arguments. His demonstration that a Danish scholar, Rasmus Rask, deserves much of the honor which scholars of German birth or German education have bestowed upon Jacob Grimm, is largely repeated from his biography of Rask (Copenhagen). The

excellent account of children's language is based upon a book published in Danish and entitled *Nutidssprog* (Copenhagen). The greater part of Book IV, *Development of Language*, amounts virtually to a new edition of his *Progress in Language* (out of print).

One of the best of the new contributions is the demonstration that the broken speech of foreigners can have very little permanent influence upon language<sup>1</sup>. We in America know that such is the case here, but various scholars have undertaken to explain many linguistic developments as due to the learning of a new language by an entire community. Professor Jespersen points out serious objections to Ascoli's ascription to the Celts of the fronting of French *u*, and to the Iberians of the substitution of Spanish *h* for Latin *f*. The attempts to foist the Germanic sound-shifts upon Finns, Celts, Rhaetians, or Etruscans are quite without reasonable basis. Professor Jespersen even doubts the responsibility of the Dravidians for the cacuminals of Sanskrit and its descendants. In this connection is given an excellent account of the contact-languages, such as *Beach-la-Mar* and *Pidgin English*. These are shown not to be composite languages, as has usually been supposed. *Beach-la-Mar* results from the attempt of Polynesians to speak English, *Pidgin English* from the attempt of Chinese to speak English, and the Chinook jargon from the attempt of Englishmen and Americans to speak Chinook. If in any such case intercourse continues between the speakers of the two basic languages, the jargon constantly approaches the language which the speakers are trying to use. If, on the other hand, intercourse should cease, Americans of the Northwest would certainly speak only English, while natives of the Pacific islands and of the Chinese coast would return to the exclusive use of Polynesian and Chinese respectively. In neither case would the contact-jargon leave permanent traces, except perhaps upon vocabulary.

Professor Jespersen's attitude toward phonetic change is similar to that which exposed my little book on *Linguistic Change* to the withering contempt of one of the straightest sect of linguistic Pharisees (*Classical Philology* 14.91-92)<sup>2</sup>. Professor Jespersen's lucid argument is not likely to shake such as he, but the chief reason for the usual regularity of phonetic change is to be found in the proneness of mankind to imitation. In other words, the regularity of the phonetic laws is in the main to be explained by psychology—not by physics or physiology, as is often stated.

The original changes as distinct from their imitation—the primary changes, as Professor Oertel calls them—are due to various causes, but our author shows that many of them can be grouped together as manifestations of the human tendency towards economy of effort. Whitney long ago gave this as the chief cause of phonetic change, but in the meantime the orthodox school has usually pooh-poohed the idea. It has re-

mained for the leading phonetician of our times to show how surprisingly many of the observed changes of sound actually involve a lessening of muscular action.

The constant tendency to omit or to simplify articulations is held in check chiefly by our desire to make ourselves understood. The conflict of the two desiderata, ease and intelligibility of articulation, is very apparent to those who speak indistinctly, to public speakers, to those who speak while holding a pipe between the teeth or while chewing their food, and to all who use the telephone. No doubt it is present in some degree in all our speaking. This, of course, amounts to saying that phonetic laws may be thwarted by psychological causes, whereas the orthodox opinion is that phonetic laws operate without the cognizance of the speaker and are therefore independent of his volitional action. In fact, Professor Jespersen boldly rejects all the half-mystical dogmas about phonetic law which have often been regarded as fundamental in our science, but which have made those familiar with other sciences look askance at us.

Etymology is another branch of the science which needs renovation, and our author repeats Breal's protest against those etymologists who "jump intermediate steps in order at once to mount to the earliest stages of language". In particular he objects to the assumption of Indo-European stems for words that do not appear until comparatively late. For such words borrowing or some sort of analogical origin is much more probable. Professor Jespersen's feeling about the matter is shared by many linguists, including Meillet, who estimates (*Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue Grecque*<sup>3</sup>, 59), that less than a tenth of the etymologies in our dictionaries are certain. It is to be hoped that we may soon have etymological dictionaries which shall pay more attention to loan-words and to words which have originated in the separate history of the language treated, and very much less attention to mere guesses about Indo-European roots. It is only fair to add that the worst offences of this sort are not chargeable to the authors of dictionaries, but to certain persons who regard etymology as a superior kind of acrostic, which permits several different solutions. Examples of this sort of writing may be found in *Classical Philology* 3.74-86, 5.303-308, 9.145-159. Boisacq and Walde had the good sense to reject or to omit many of the Greek and Latin etymologies suggested in these pages.

Professor Jespersen is more successful in arguing against current etymological methods than in proposing new ones. He undertakes to apply to this subject his view of the importance of psychological factors in phonetic change, especially in the way of interfering with their regularity. Such things as he assumes in this connection have probably happened not infrequently; but it is far from certain that the particular words discussed have had just this history. Etymology is difficult at best, and there is little chance of tracing to their origin words which have not come down the main current of phonetic development. It is still true that we must observe the phonetic laws under

<sup>1</sup>This is the burden of an excellent paper by Professor George Hempl (*Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 29 [1898], 31-47), to which Professor Jespersen acknowledges his indebtedness.

<sup>2</sup>For a review, generally favorable, of Dr. Starrevant's book, by Professor G. M. Bolling, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.148-150. C. K.



penalty of banishment from the community of etymologists (compare Jespersen, 297).

Unlike many scholars, Professor Jespersen has the skill and takes the pains to make his publications works of art. This book may be recommended not only to those who want to keep up with a subject of the first importance, but also to all in search of an interesting and stimulating book. Nothing more attractive on the science of language has appeared since the days of Whitney and Max Müller. In fact, a New York newspaper has reprinted a few pages of the book—under a misleading headline—in its "Magazine Section".

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT

The Greek Orators. By J. F. Dobson. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company (1919). Pp. 321.

The one indispensable work on the Attic Orators for the serious student is Die Attische Beredsamkeit of Friedrich Blass. By the side of these scholarly volumes should be found always the work entitled The Attic Orators, by Sir Richard C. Jebb, an admirable treatment of the period covered, namely, from Antiphon to Isaeus. Professor Dobson, in his brief Preface to the new volume in this field, disclaims any idea of superseding these standard and invaluable works. The object of his book "is to provide a reasonably short account of the works of the Orators and to give a general idea of the style of each". He aims to do this

...not by applying methods of scientific analysis, but by giving numerous quotations from the speeches to emphasise the points which I wished to bring out. I have therefore avoided as far as possible the technicalities of criticism, and illustrated my remarks by translations of characteristic passages, hoping thus to make my work easily accessible not only to classical students, but also to others who, while generally interested in the Classics, have not the time or the capacity to study them in the original.

It will be of interest, I think, to indicate the precise nature of the contents of the book and the space allotted to the individual authors. Chapter I (1-18) is devoted to the Beginnings of Oratory, II (19-49) to Antiphon, III (50-73) to Thrasyarchus-Andocides, IV (74-102) to Lysias, V (103-125) to Isaeus, VI (126-159) to Isocrates, VII (160-162) to Minor Rhetoricians, VIII (163-198) to Aeschines, IX (199-267) to Demosthenes, X (268-270) to Phocion, Demades, Pytheas, XI (271-307) to Lycurgus, Hypereides, Dinarchus, XII (308-314) to The Decline of Oratory.

At the outset it may be said that Professor Dobson's book is a creditable performance and is based on accurate knowledge of the subject handled. It will be of distinct service to the beginner in this field, the student who is unacquainted with the Orators and wishes a brief and simple introduction to them. But the brevity of the treatment will necessitate immediate reference to Jebb's work for fuller information and more stimulating and suggestive presentation.

In the chapter on the Beginnings of Oratory the discussion of Gorgias does not, in my opinion, do justice to that rhetorician. The authenticity of the Enco-

mium on Helen, thought genuine by Blass, Norden, and the present reviewer (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6. 122-123), is doubted by Professor Dobson, and consequently no extract from that interesting composition is given by him. Nor is the influence of the Gorgian style sufficiently stressed. Professor Dobson says (18): "Antiphon and Thucydides suffered severely from the contagion of his style". But did they not also profit greatly by it and borrow to advantage from it?

In proof of Antiphon's neglect of real pleading on the basis of evidence the writer says (36, 43):

...The defendant in the Herodes case mentions quite casually that he never left the ship on the night when the murder was committed on shore, but he produces no evidence for the alibi and treats it as of quite secondary importance.

Professor Dobson seems here to be following Jebb (1.60), who also makes this strange assertion, whereas in the actual speech we find the following striking statements and evidence: 'I did not leave the ship at all' (§ 26); 'I furnished witnesses that I did not leave the ship' (§ 27); 'He denied that I left the ship at all' (§ 42, at the end). Of course, generally speaking, the statement holds good, namely, that Antiphon makes arguments from probabilities, etc., of more importance than the actual evidence. But this is generally true of Attic legal pleading as contrasted with modern practice.

In the translation of Hermogenes's criticism of Andocides (58) πολιτικός is mistranslated by 'statesman'; the correct rendering is given by Blass, "Meister der praktischen Rede", and by Jebb, "practical orator".

The chapter on Lysias is, on the whole, good, but Lysias's most important speech, the Oration against Eratosthenes, is inadequately discussed, and the virtues of the style of Lysias, so admirably elucidated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, do not receive sufficient emphasis.

The account of Demosthenes is quite comprehensive and will be of service to the student who is making a first acquaintance with the greatest of the Canon of the Ten, especially in view of the fact that in his Attic Orators Jebb does not give full treatment to Demosthenes. And yet here Professor Dobson, in my opinion, devotes too little space to the greatest of all Athenian speeches, the Oration on the Crown. He says: "The speech cannot be represented by extracts; it must be read as a whole to be appreciated". The latter part of the foregoing statement is true, but a few of the finest and most inspired passages, such as are found in Jebb, might well have been quoted to give some indication of the nature of the speech and of the genius of Demosthenes, that the reader might be impelled to turn to the oration itself and read it from beginning to end.

BARNARD COLLEGE,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LARUE VAN HOOK

The Making of Latin: An Introduction to Latin, Greek, and English Etymology. By R. S. Conway. New York: The Macmillan Company (1923). Pp. ix + 146.

No allied subject—not even archeology or history—



has more to contribute to the study of Greek and Latin literature than has comparative grammar: and yet only a small proportion of classical teachers and a smaller proportion of classical students make the acquaintance of that subject. One reason is that, with few exceptions, Colleges and Universities make no such provision for the scientific study of Greek and Latin grammar as is made, as a matter of course, for the similar study of English, German, and the Romance languages. A second reason is that there are no books from which a student can readily learn comparative grammar without the help of a teacher. Almost the only book in English that treats of scientific Latin grammar and is suitable for a beginner is *Outlines of Latin Phonetics*, by Max Niedermann, edited by Strong and Stewart (London, 1910), and this book treats of Latin alone, avoiding all comparison.

There is no mystery as to why the needed book has remained unwritten; comparative grammar is a difficult subject, and, if it is treated systematically, the early stages of the study are bound to be dull. How hard it is to write such a book is shown by Professor Conway's attempt. In order to avoid tables of sound-correspondences and lists of examples, he has abandoned any attempt at a logical arrangement of Chapters III-VI (pages 24-82). On page 25 Professor Conway seems to begin the treatment of the regular representation of Indo-European sounds in the historical languages with the statement that the Indo-European 'neutral vowel' appears in Sanskrit as *i* and in Greek and Latin as *ē*. Then follow, in this order, an explanation of the use of the sign (:), an account of 'Grimm and Verner's Law', several paragraphs on accent and ablaut, and, in connection with ablaut, an account of the Indo-European syllabic nasals and their development in the historical languages. A striking illustration of the disorder thus produced is to be found on page 78, where the change of intervocalic *s* to *r* is treated under the heading "Peculiar Features of Borrowed Words". Possibly this form of presentation is justified by the need to make the book readable, but from such a treatment a reader cannot get an idea of the almost mathematical consistency and logic of the science.

A more serious defect is that the author repeatedly makes definite statements on controversial points without a hint that there are rival opinions. A book for beginners is no place for the balancing of probabilities; but to state as sure what is really doubtful is to break faith with the reader. Furthermore, such a practice defeats its own end. It makes for simplicity, no doubt, to state positively (page 81) that the ablative of the gerund comes from the accusative of a verbal noun in *-em* or *-om* (*\*ferem*, *\*regom*, etc.) followed by the preposition *\*dō*, which appears in English *to*, and, with a short vowel, in Latin *indū*; but sooner or later the student who has mastered this doctrine will have the very foundations of his grammatical knowledge shaken when he learns that there is no real evidence that Latin ever had such accusatives of verbal nouns as *\*ferem* and *\*regom*. In this particular case Professor

Conway has himself provided a basis for such an intellectual disaster, in a note on page 127.

There is comparatively little in the book that calls for correction, although the reviewer disagrees with several bits of orthodox teaching here repeated. The chapter on phonetics (pages 14-23) is, however, unsatisfactory in many ways. The vocal chords are not muscles (page 14). The absurd phrase "neutral vowel" (page 16, etc.) should be given up by comparative grammarians. We do not know what the Indo-European sound was which yielded Sanskrit *ī* and European *ā*; but we may be quite sure that this vowel (unless there were really several distinct vowels which developed in the same way in most of the later languages) had as definite a physiological basis and acoustic quality as has the vowel of English *but*, which also has been dubbed 'neutral' because we have no separate alphabetic character for it.

A consonant is defined (page 16) as a sound which cannot be heard unless combined with a sonant (i. e. vowel); but *r*, *l*, *y*, and *w* are listed as consonants. Nevertheless, Professor Conway speaks of sonant *r* and sonant *l* as well as of consonant *i* and consonant *u*. The most nearly satisfactory way to handle this old difficulty is to call every *r* and *l* consonantal, and to define the term consonant as indicating more narrowing of the vocal passage at some point than is found in any vowel sound. Then there is no inconsistency in speaking of certain consonants as carrying their syllables; although they are, as always, less open and less sonorous than any vowels, they are more sonorous than the sounds which stand next them in certain words.

It goes without saying that such a scholar as Professor Conway is familiar with the recent literature of his subject, but it is a pity that he has seen fit to omit all references. Bibliographical footnotes are easily skipped by the superficial student, and they are sometimes of great assistance to the better sort of students. There is an acknowledgement of indebtedness to Brugmann and to Roby in the Preface, and Brugmann is mentioned half a dozen times in the body of the work. Three or four other scholars are named rather casually; but the three names which might be expected, even if no others were to be mentioned, nowhere occur. Lindsay's *Short Historical Latin Grammar* and his *Latin Language*, Sommer's *Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, and Walde's *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* should certainly have been mentioned as works to which an interested reader might turn for fuller treatment of the topics here introduced.

Professor Conway's primer is attractively written, and it is as easy to read as a book on this subject could well be made. It may be used to good advantage in connection with introductory courses on scientific Latin grammar. On account of the blemishes mentioned above it is not to be recommended to those who wish to read on comparative grammar without the aid of a teacher. Their needs are still to be supplied.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT

### SCHOLARSHIPS OF THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB CLASSICAL MEDALS

The tenth semiannual competitive scholarship examination given by The New York Classical Club was held at Hunter College, New York City, June 16, 1923. Forty-five candidates appeared, thirty-seven taking the Latin examination, eight the Greek. This is the largest number of competitors that have ever appeared at these examinations. The Latin Scholarship, \$150, was won by Miss Marie Vagts, of Hunter College High School, with 87%; honorable mention was awarded to Miss Lillian Schwartzman, of Morris High School, and Miss Evelyn Behrens, of Curtis High School. The Greek Scholarship, \$75, goes to Miss Eugenia Frysick, of Wadleigh High School, with 80%; honorable mention was awarded to Miss Dorothy Kleitman, also of Wadleigh, and Jacob Orlinsky, of Eastern District High School. The winners will be required to take courses in Latin or Greek during their Freshman year in College in order to receive these awards.

The Club has long felt the inadequacy of the Greek Scholarship, and an effort is now being made to increase it to \$150. Contributions to the Greek Scholarship Endowment Fund of the Club will be welcome from any friends of the Classics who feel moved to give.

A new feature of the work of The New York Classical Club in endeavoring to stimulate a wider interest in the Classics among the pupils of the public High Schools of New York City is the awarding of a medal each term, beginning with this June, to that member of the graduating class in each city High School who, in the judgment of the Classical Department of his School, has made the highest standing in the full course in Latin or in Greek as given in his School. The Club's scholarships can go to only one pupil in each language in the entire city; and these pupils must have read Vergil or Homer. The medals will enable pupils of excellence even in those Schools that can not offer the full regular classical courses to obtain recognition for work in as much of the courses as is open to them. Further details in this matter may be obtained from Miss Margaret V. Henry, of Wadleigh High School, New York City.

HARWOOD HOADLEY,

*Chairman, Committee on Award of Scholarships*

### CLASSICAL CLUB OF GREATER BOSTON

The Annual Meeting of the Classical Club of Greater Boston was held at Boston University, on Saturday, May 26, with the President, Professor Alexander H. Rice, in the chair. In the first address Professor W. J. Battle, of the University of Texas, emphasized the resemblance between the chief issues of the World War and those of the Peloponnesian War, as told by Thucydides.

Professor E. Charlton Black, of the English Department of Boston University, spoke in a most interesting manner of his life as a student in Edinburg University in the seventies, and showed how the teaching of Blackie and Sellar in the Classics laid a solid foundation in English for such men as Stevenson, Barrie, Carlyle, and Browning.

ALBERT S. PERKINS, *Censor*

### A NOTE BY MR. SHEWAN

The Homeric Cemetery referred to in my article, *Repetition in Homer and Tennyson*, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.153, was the cemetery discovered by Dörpfeld, in Leukas (S. Maura). There was a paper on

this cemetery, by Dörpfeld, in the *Neue Jahrbücher* for 1912, pp. 13 f., bearing the title *Zu den Altgriechischen Bestattungssitten*.

ALEXANDER SHEWAN

### DEAN HENRY M. BATES ON

### THE CLASSICS AND THE STUDENT OF LAW<sup>1</sup>

Greek and Latin unquestionably are among the most valuable of studies for the prospective lawyer, and for these reasons, among others:

(1) The successful lawyer must be a man of broad culture, with a cultivated imagination and some familiarity with the great literatures of the world.

(2) A student cannot become proficient in these studies—he cannot even pass his College courses in them—without applying his mind with concentration and discrimination to his work. In this respect these studies afford a gratifying contrast to many of the lecture courses of the present day, in which the professor merely recites predigested intellectual pabulum to his students. The discipline of mind acquired in the study of these admirable languages and the acquisition of the ability to concentrate, and the development of the will power in accomplishing difficult tasks, are of the utmost importance to the lawyer.

(3) In translating either Greek or Latin into English, the student frequently finds several more or less synonymous English words for the Greek or Latin word which he is looking up. He must determine from the context and the other data which of these is the correct meaning to give to the term, in his translation. High qualities of judgment, analysis, and discrimination are called for. These are the very qualities which the lawyer must cultivate in construing or interpreting a Supreme Court opinion, a Constitutional clause or a statute, and he also must exercise much the same faculties as those used in the process of translation.

(4) A great many of the technical terms in law are taken from the classical languages, chiefly the Latin language. The experienced Latin student will read a great deal of our legal literature with much more ease and understanding than the student who has not had the advantage of such work.

### THE CLASSICAL CLUB OF PHILADELPHIA

The 168th meeting of The Classical Club of Philadelphia was held on Friday, April 13, with thirty-eight members and guests present. The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Professor Walter Woodburn Hyde, of the University of Pennsylvania; Vice-President, Dr. Wilton W. Blancké, of the Southern High School; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Benjamin W. Mitchell, of the Central High School. The meeting took the form of a testimonial dinner in honor of Dr. William Hyde Appleton, the oldest living charter member of the Club, and Emeritus Professor of Greek at Swarthmore College. At the close of the dinner, Dr. Appleton read a paper entitled *In Reminiscent Vein*. A graduate of Harvard, in 1864, he told of his contact with the great literary figures of that day, of the University life, curriculum, and programmes. He described his exciting experiences in Paris in 1870, and his University life at Bonn and Berlin. The most delightful portion of the paper dealt with his experiences in Greece in a day when travel in that country was more primitive than it is to-day and when the people were simple and unspoiled.

B. W. MITCHELL, *Secretary*

<sup>1</sup>Professor Bates is Dean of the Law School of the University of Michigan. THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY owes the extract to the courtesy of Professor Francis W. Kelsey. C. K.